DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 961 RC 014 401

AUTHOR Bokemeier, Janet; And Others.
TITLE Whatever Happened to Rural Women? A Comparative Study of Labor Force Participation.
INSTITUTION Kentucky Univ., Lexington. Dept. of Sociology.
SPONS AGENCY Kentucky Univ., Lexington. Agricultural Experiment Station.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Rural Sociological Meeting (Ithaca, NY, August, 1980). Reports results of Project No. 830, Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Educational Needs; Educational Status Comparison; *Employment Patterns; Family Income; *Females; Labor Force Nonparticipants; Occupational Surveys; *Participant Characteristics; Rural Economics; Rural Family; *Rural Farm Residents; *Rural Nonfarm Residents; Rural Population; Rural Urban Differences; *Urban Population; Wages
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky

ABSTRACT

A 1979 Kentucky study comparing rural farm and nonfarm women to each other and to women residing in metropolitan areas examined women's labor force participation. A statewide mail survey of Kentucky adults produced usable questionnaires from 3 groups of women: farm women (1,231), nonmetropolitan women (3,631), and metropolitan women (937). Dependent variables were women's labor force participation (full- or part-time), attitudes toward unemployment, satisfaction with job opportunities, job efficacy, and attitude toward small, family farms. Farm women, working or not, tended to be older (median age 45-49) than metropolitan/nonmetropolitan women (median age 40-44). In all groups, younger women were more likely to be working. About half of nonfarm women were employed full- or part-time; 38% of farm women were working off the farm. Working women in all three groups were concentrated in white-collar occupations and in service industries. In all groups, working women had completed more years of education than nonworking women; with labor force participation constant, farm women had the least educational attainment. Among working women, the major determinant of job efficacy was education, followed by income. Policy implications included a need for adequate training for high-wage jobs for rural women. (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235961

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO RURAL WOMEN?[1]
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION

coauthored

by

Janet Bokemeier
Verna Keith
Carolyn Sachs

Department of Sociology
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40546

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Janet Bokemeier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC014401

[1]Paper presented at Rural Sociological Society Annual Meeting, August, 1980, Ithaca, New York. Research was supported by the Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station (Project No. 830). Data were collected under the direction of James Christenson and Paul Warner.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO RURAL WOMEN?

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION

Changes in industry and the structure of agriculture in the United States have altered the type of work performed by rural women. Sociological research on the work of rural women has been scant (Joyce and Leadley, 1977; Boulding, 1979). While research on rural women has surfaced in the late 1970's, studies of farm women's work and rural nonfarm women's work are both only in exploratory stages. The purposes of this paper are to (a) develop a general description of rural women based on social, farm, and personal characteristics and (b) examine how women have been affected by the rural way of life and labor force participation.

Most studies of the labor force participation of women either fail to include farm women or tend to be based upon national samples containing too few respondents for separate analysis (Sweet, 1972). Furthermore, in many studies women residing on farms and those in rural nonfarm areas are treated as one group. Thus, there may be important demographic differences between these women which have been overlooked.

One consequence of women's subordinate place in American society has been the undervaluing of the contribution of women's labor. Joyce and Leadley (1977) have noted that in 1922, 1926, and 1976, rural women attending agricultural conferences have expressed a desire that the importance of their work be recognized. Rural women have historically been involved in various combinations of farm work, off-farm work, and domestic labor. The plight of rural women who do not live on farms differs from farm and urban women. For example, women in rural areas typically have lower educational levels compared to their metropolitan counterparts which limits the types of

employment possibilities available to them. In addition, job opportunities in rural areas are scarce and often limited to jobs in low-wage industries. Women's labor contribution in all of these spheres has been undervalued and underexamined by researchers, policy makers, rural men and many rural women themselves.

In this paper, we will first present a brief historical account of population and employment trends of rural women in the United States. Secondly, based on a large statewide sample of adult women, we will examine the demographic characteristics of women who live in rural areas of Kentucky with an emphasis on work which rural women perform. In analysis, the differences between farm women and rural women who do not live on farms will be explored. Then, we will examine the socioeconomic correlates of women's labor force participation. Finally, the attitudes of rural women towards their jobs and farm policies will be discussed.

Who are Rural Women?

Transformations in agriculture and industry have resulted in a dramatic redistribution of the population in the twentieth century. In 1900, 39.3 percent of the U.S. population lived on farms. As of 1978, a mere three percent of the population of the United States live on farms. When examining the situation of rural women, it is important to note that the proportion of women living in rural areas has declined dramatically as more and more women have moved to cities from 1940 through the 1960's. In 1970, 28 percent of women lived in rural areas compared to 44 percent in 1940. In the 1960's the annual growth rate for metropolitan counties was 1.6 percent compared to 0.4 percent for nonmetropolitan counties. However, between 1970 and 1974 this trend reversed itself such that metropolitan counties had a growth rate of 0.8 percent versus 1.3 percent for nonmetropolitan counties (Morrison and Wheeler, 1976). Thus, in the last decade, we witness a growth in the rural population.

Due to the increasing difficulty of earning a subsistence income from farming, many people who now live in rural areas do not live on farms. In addition, many people have migrated from urban areas. Of the rural women, 85 percent lived on farms in 1940 compared to 15 percent in 1970. As fewer women reside on farms, off-farm job opportunities increase in importance. An increasing number of both farm women and rural nonfarm women are working off the farm, but little is known about the occupations and industries in which women are engaged. In examining women's work status, we will compare the demographic profile with respect to age, marital status, farm, metropolitan proimity, number of children, family income, occupation, and industry of rural farm, nonmetropolitan and metropolitan women.

Farm Women's Work

As rural people continually changed from subsistence production to production for the market, there was an increased need for cash income. In order to meet this need for cash, rural girls were frequently sent off the farm to perform wage labor. As early as 1791, Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, "hailed factory employment for women because it made development of the new system possible without taking men from the fields" (Baker, 1964). Thus historically, the farm household has attempted to maintain itself as a production unit by sending young girls to work in factories.

In the twentieth century, we witness an increasing inability of rural people to support themselves on the land. As costs rise faster than prices, farm producers are faced with a decline in income. As a consequence, many farm families have lost their land and have been forced to move to urban areas. An option to selling the farm and moving to the city is the selling of labor. In 1978, all farm families combined received 56 percent of their income from off-farm sources. Families on smaller farms are more likely to rely on off-farm income. On farms with sales of less than $5,000 annually, 90 percent of the income is from off-farm sources (U.S.D.A., 1979). According to Hedley

(1976) the adoption of an off-farm work pattern is a direct result of low income and is an option which is pursued only when all others fail. However, Hedley does not discuss whether women's off-farm work follows the same pattern as men's. Although women often have been the first to seek off-farm employment, as the cost-price squeeze on the farm becomes more severe, the employment of women in off-farm jobs does not provide enough cash income to sustain the farm. In these cases it becomes essential for the male to obtain off-farm employment, since men are generally able to obtain higher wages than women.

Job opportunities, the differential between women and men's wages, the success of farming operations, the stage of the family life cycle, and women's involvement in farm operations are among the conditions which effect whether women and/or men work for wages. In 1958, one-fourth of all farm women had off-farm jobs (Baker, 1964). The discrepancy between the labor force participation rates of farm women and other women decreased between 1960 and 1966 (Terry et al., 1974).

In his study of married farm women, Sweet (1972) concluded that farm women were increasingly entering the paid labor force, i.e., off-farm jobs. According to his study, there is a positive relationship between farm women's employment and proximity to a metropolitan area, southern residence, and education. He also found that the number of children under 18 had no systematic effect on the likelihood that farm women would enter the labor force.

The present study departs from that of Sweet's by looking at the employment of rural nonfarm women as well as farm women and comparing these two groups of women with those residing in metropolitan areas. The study is not limited to married women under age 60 but includes all women 18 years and older, regardless of marital status. As in previous research, we anticipate that age, education, and income will influence whether women enter the nonfarm labor force. Among nonmetropolitan women (both farm and

nonfarm), proximity to metropolitan area and, thus, improved occupational opportunities will be positively related to working. Among farm women, we anticipate that women on smaller farms with less farm sales will be more likely to enter the nonfarm labor force.

Rural Nonfarm Women's Work

Rural women who do not live on farms are faced with different situations in terms of employment than farm women. However, research on rural women has often been based on comparative studies examining rural-urban differences. In these cases, rural women are treated as a homogenous social group such that the differences between farm women and rural nonfarm women are ignored. Recently, a number of studies have investigated the work of farm women (e.g., Pearson, 1979; Boulding, 1979; Lodwick and Fassinger, 1979; Salamon and Keim, 1979; Wilkening and Ahrens, 1979). In contrast, the work of rural women who do not live on farms has been relatively neglected by researchers.

From the advent of the factory system in the U.S. to the present time, specific jobs were designated primarily for women. Regardless of whether women reside in rural or urban areas, they are generally employed in a labor market which is distinct from the male labor market. According to Oppenheimer (1970) employed women are concentrated in low-wage jobs. Furthermore, these jobs tend to be perceived as an extension of the "natural" female role and, therefore, are sex typed. This, in effect, limits occupational opportunities for women.

Recent efforts at rural industrialization, particularly in the South, frequently have looked to rural women for a supply of cheap labor. These industries, for the most part, tend to be part of the periphery, as opposed to the core, of the industrial sector characterized by low profits, low productivity, intensive product market competition, and lack of unionization

(Beck, et al., 1978). The perpetuation of the ideology that women's primary responsibility is the home has allowed employers to continue to hire women at low wage levels especially in the periphery. Thus, we expect to find that rural nonfarmwomen are more likely to work in peripheral industries and have a lower family income than metropolitan women.

Attitudes of Rural Women

Since rural women are increasing employed in the nonfarm labor force, we will attempt to examine their attitudes toward unemployment, job opportunities, job efficacy, and small farm policy. There are a limited number of jobs available to women in rural areas, and as has been mentioned, these jobs are often in low wage industries. Women with less education and family income are forced to compete for a minimal number of low-status and low-wage jobs. In addition, these jobs offer little opportunity for advancement. It is hypothesized that these women will perceive unemployment to be a problem and will be less satisfied with job opportunities.

For those women who do work, we will attempt to determine the degree to which they had influence in their jobs. We expect that education, income, age, and metropolitan proximity will be positively related to job efficacy.

Finally, we will assess rural women's attitudes towards small farm policy. Government policies which determine whether people will be able to remain on their farms and be economically viable significantly effect the life choices for rural women. We will attempt to determine which rural women are in favor of policies which support the small farm. For all of these attitudinal measures, the effect of women's residence and work is examined.

PROCEDURES

The data for this study were gathered in the spring of 1979 as part of a statewide mail survey of Kentucky adults. Utilizing voter registration files, a sample of 15,945 potential respondents was developed. Of these people, 11,015

returned usable questionnaires for a response rate of 69.1 percent. Over half of these respondents consisted of women (N=5,880). Disproportionate sampling was utilized in order to facilitate the analyses of certain subgroups of the Kentucky population namely, the rural farm population. This sampling technique made it possible to distinguish, on the basis of residence, three groups of women. Farm women (N=1,231) were identified on the basis of reported farm size and/or farm sales greater than $1,000. The remaining women were classified as metropolitan (N=937) or nonmetropolitan (N=3,631) by using Bureau of the Census definitions of those residence concepts.

The dependent variables in the study are women's labor force participation, attitude toward unemployment, satisfaction with job opportunities, job efficacy, and attitude toward small, family farms. Women's labor force participation is based on current employment. Working women are those who are employed part- or full-time, while women who are unemployed, retired, or homemakers are classified as not in the labor force. For farm women, those who reported a nonfarm occupation were considered working. Thus women who are working on the farm are classified as not working. Unfortunately, we have no measure of the extent of women's participation in farm work.

The degree to which the respondent agrees or disagrees with the statement "Unemployment is a serious problem in the community" is the indicator of attitude towards unemployment. Responses are measured on a five-point scale form strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Satisfaction with job opportunities is measured by the respondent's answer to the question, "How satisfied are you with job opportunities?" This measure is on a seven-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (7). Job efficacy is a scale consisting of the degree to which the respondent agrees with the four items (see Appendix A). Responses to each statement range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Attitude toward small farm policy is a

three item scale (see Appendix A). The possible responses for each item are the same as for the job efficacy scale.

FINDINGS

Labor Force Participation

Table 1 shows the employment status for the three groups of women and indicates whether employed women worked full- or part-time. Over half (53.6%) of the metropolitan women were employed, while only 47.7 percent of the nonmetropolitan and 37.8 percent of the farm women reported themselves as employed. Farm women were slightly more likely to be employed part-time than were nonmetropolitan women. However, nonmetropolitan women were more likely to be employed full-time than were farm women. A larger percentage of farm women reported themsleves as being homemakers than did either metropolitan or nonmetropolitan women. Farm women were also more likely to be retired. This is probably a reflection of their older age distribution.

Looking only at employed women within each group, nonmetropolitan women had the largest percent of full-time workers, 77.8 percent. Seventy-one percent and 70.7 percent of employed metropolitan and farm women, respectively, were employed full-time. Thus, we found a large proportion of women actively participating in the nonfarm labor force, regardless of residence.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 2 presents demographic characteristics of each group of women in the sample. Since the characteristics of each group may vary by labor force participation, they were further classified as either working or not working. Farm women, whether working or not, tend to be older than either metropolitan or nonmetropolitan women. The median age of farm women fell in the 45-49 years old category (not shown), while the median age of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan women fell in the 40-44 years of age group (not shown). Among working women, those living in metropolitan areas are slightly older than those living in nonmetropolitan areas. However, among women not working the opposite is found.

In all three groups, working women had completed more years of education than had women not working. With labor force participation held constant, farm women had the least educational attainment. Among working women, 55.3 percent of metropolitan women had some college or higher level of education. However, differences between farm women and nonmetropolitan women were slight with 46.3 percent of the latter having had some college of higher level of education.

Working women, whether living on farms, in metropolitan or nonmetropolitan areas had family incomes higher than those not working. This indicates that the economic status of the family is very much related to the labor force participation of the woman. Although farm women had less family income than metropolitan women, they had higher family income than did nonmetropolitan women. This was also true when labor force participation was held constant. Among working women, 55.7 percent of those living in nonmetropolitan areas had family incomes below $15,000. This compares to 38.9 percent for farm women and 39.6 percent for metropolitan women. At the upper end of the income spectrum, farm and metropolitan women were more likely to have family incomes of $30,000 or more than were nonmetropolitan women.

Within each group the majority of women were married at the time of the survey. Farm women were more likely to report themselves as married than were metropolitan and nonmetropolitan women. Looking at working women only, 90.5 percent of the farm women were married compared to 69.4 percent of metropolitan women and 69.8 percent of nonmetropolitan women. It may be noted that farm women were least likely to report themselves as never married than were women in the other two groups. None of the farm women reported themsleves as separated. It could be argued that this is due to the fact that farm wives would probably leave the farm and move to another area upon separating from their husbands. Finally, farm women were more likely to be widowed than were nonfarm women. This probably reflects the older age distribution of farm women.

As might be expected, working women had fewer children under 18 than women not working. Differences between the three groups of women varied according to labor force participation. Among working women, metropolitan women had an average of 1.90 children under 18 followed by farm women with 1.8 and nonmetropolitan women with 1.77. Since we would expect an inverse relationship between age and children under 18 and since nonmetropolitan working women tended to be younger, this finding was not anticipated. However, data for nonworking women did follow the expected pattern.

Overall, the farm women tended to live on rather small farms with about 76 percent living on farms with less that 180 acres (Table 3). In addition, the majority of farm women, 73 percent, lived on farms which grossed less than $10,000 in sales. Like male farm operators, women on smaller farms and those with less farm sales were more likely to enter the labor force. It is interesting to note, that women on the smallest and least sales were not as likely to enter the labor market as those in the middle categories. This may reflect the lack of off-farm, job opportunities that were competitive with the value of the women's labor contribution on the farm.

Occupation and Industrial Conditions

Taking only those women who indicated that they were in the labor force, Table 4 presents the occupational distribution of women working part- and full-time. Among full-time workers in each of the three groups, over half the women were concentrated in the professional-clergy and clerical occupations. Among farm women employed part-time the largest percentage was found in the clerical occupation. Among metropolitan and nonmetropolitan women employed part-time, a significant percentage (22% and 24.2% respectively) were in the service-military category. Women in all three groups were underrepresented in crafts.

Industry of employed women as well as occupational distribution provides some indication of their status in the job world. Although the majority of women, working both full- and part-time, are employed in white-collar occu-

pations, they tend to be overrepresented in some industries and underrepresented in others. Our sample of Kentucky women was no exception (Table 5). Women in each of the three groups, whether employed full- or part-time were concentrated in the service industry. The percentage in industries such as construction and wholesale trade, traditionally dominated by males, was quite small. Except for farm women working full-time, the second largest industry for women was that of retail trade. The second largest industry for farm and nonmetropolitan women working full-time was that of nondurable good manufacturing. Nondurable manufacturing industries are part of the peripheral sector of the economy. We find support for the hypothesis that rural women are more likely to be employed in the peripheral sector than are metropolitan women.

Correlates of Women's Active Labor Force Particpation

To examine the factors associated with work outside the home, several personal, family and economic characteristics were selected on the basis of earlier studies of labor force participation. The correlates selected for study were age, highest educational level achieved, family income, number of children under 18 living in the home, and their residential proximity to a metropolitan area. Data analyses included zero-order correlation analysis and multiple regression. Separate analyses were conducted for farm and nonfarm nonmetropolitan women. The reason for separate analyses was to examine the differential patterns in the relationships of residential factors with working.

Few differences were found in the zero-order correlation of background characteristics and working by residence (Table 6). In comparing metropolitan and farm women, education and income, although consistently a positive relationship, were more highly correlated with working in the farm group. In all groups, younger women were more likely to be working. In addition, having children at home and metropolitan proximity had a very weak association with working outside the home.

Table 7 presents the multiple regression analysis of active labor force participation by demographic characteristics in farm and nonfarm women in rural Kentucky. The same general trends are seen with multiple regression as were evident by the zero order correlation matrix. The standardized beta weights indicate the relative influence of each independent variable on the likelihood of active labor force participation within each residence group. Among farm women,education explains the largest variance in working outside the home. Age and income also are demonstrated to be important variables for understanding women's working. The number of children under eighteen years of age and distance from a metropolitan center showed little influence. Among rural nonfarm women, age was the most influential variable. With other covariates held constant, the number of children at home explains more variance than either income or education. Thus the findings suggest that among nonfarm rural women, the younger women without children are more likely to work outside the home. Family income as an indicator of family social status is positively, moderately related to working.

The unstandardized beta coefficients allow the comparison of the importance of demographic characteristics on women's working out of the home across groups. Clearly, the basic demographic characteristic of age, income and education are important variables related to womens' labor force participation. Among nonfarm rural women, age is clearly the most influential variable whereas among farm women it is only slightly stronger than education (-.677 as compared to .661). Number of children is related much stronger to working for nonfarm women. Thus, the results of multiple regression analyses suggest that different correlates are significant in explaining active labor force participation of rural farm and nonfarm women.

Attitudes of Rural Women

Table 8 presents the regression coefficients for determinants of rural women's attitudes toward unemployment, job opportunities, job efficacy, and

small farm policy. The independent variables which are significantly related to the three dependent variables related to jobs are similar for women who live on farms and in nonmetropolitan areas. In no case does work have a significant relationship with the dependent variable. Thus, we find that rural women's attitudes about job opportunities, unemployment and small farm policy is not effected by their work status. Women who are younger, have less education and less family income are most likely to see unemployment as a serious problem and to be less satisfied with job opportunities. In addition, the closer the commuting distance to a metropolitan area, the more likely rural women will be satisfied with job opportunities. Among working women, the major determinant of job efficacy is education which is followed by income. In examining the relationship between the independent variables and small farm policy, it is evident from the small R^2 (.04) that little variation is explained by these variables. In effect, most rural women in Kentucky support government policies which favor small farms.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This comparative study of rural women found differences between women residing on and off farm. Demographically, farm women tended to be older and to have fewer years of educational attainment than other women. Although farm women had smaller family incomes than metropolitan women, they had greater family income than nonmetropolitan women. These and other differences support the treatment of rural farm and nonfarm women as distinct groups in research.

Consistent with other research, substantial proportion of adult women reported active, labor force participation regardless of family income level, marital status, and number of children. About half of the nonfarm women were employed on either a full- or part-time basis. Thirty-eight percent of the farm women were working off the farm. Women tended to be concentrated in traditional female occupations and industries (i.e., white-collar occupation, service industries).

Part-time farming, i.e., a farm operator holding a nonfarm job in addition to farming, has traditionally been linked with low farm sales and small acreage holdings, although the family income of part-time farmers is similar to family income levels of full-time farmers (Loomis, 1965; Sweet, 1972). However, we found that farm women from the middle categories in farm sales and size were the most likely to work off the farm. Thus it appears that farm women regardless of their economic situation are seeking jobs off the farm. Furthermore, these women are not concentrated in any one occupation or industrial category but instead are as fully integrated into the labor force as other women.

Multivariate analysis of factors associated with working outside the home found differing patterns by residence of women. Although age was the most important factor in all analyses, the number of children under 18 was significant for nonmetropolitan nonfarm women but not for farm women. One possible explanation for the differences in factors associated with working outside the home is the available child care alternatives for nonmetropolitan women. Because farms are frequently family based, other kin may provide child care for women desiring jobs off the farm.

Part-time farming is usually conceptualized by researchers solely in terms of the types of work performed by men (Ceughenour, 1980, Loomis, 1965; Fuguitt et al., 1977; Frauendorfer, 1966). We found that the entrance of women into the labor force is an option which many households chose yet research on the impact of this alternative is virtually nonexistent. This oversight by researchers on part-time farmers is one aspect of their devaluation of women's work. Part-time farming studies have not considered the impact on the male's work role when the women enter the nonfarm labor force. Men, whose wives work off the farm, have access to this additional income and may be able to continue to work full-time on the farm. Women's involvement in farm work and decisions is based on a complex relationship between land ownership (Salamon and Keim, 1979) labor input (Pearson, 1979; Lodwick and Fassinger, 1979), and management (Sawer,

1973; Wilkening and Morrison, 1963; Wilkening and Ahrens, 1979). If the woman works off the farm, the man is continued to be defined as a full-time farmer although the labor of the woman on the farm is substantially reduced. The employment of rural women has been studied as a factor which effects the farm economics. While this study does not directly address the subject of task allocation or the work which women perform on the farm, such research would be extremely useful.

Policy Implications

Policy makers in rural areas must take into account the distinction between farm and rural nonfarm women especially in areas such as labor force participation and family economic status. While both groups of women do enter the labor force to some extent, rural nonfarm women are more likely to be working than are farm women. On the other hand, a larger percentage of rural nonfarm women report that they are unemployed.

In the past, rural development policy has advocated the improvement of rural economic conditions through increased industrial development. However, this policy line has generally resulted in the provision of low-wage jobs filled in large proportion by women. Oppenheimer (1970) has pointed out that women constitute a reserve supply of cheap labor. She also notes that women's, as compared to men's, higher educational attainment provides an available supply of skilled cheap labor. In such a situation, rural women may be employed but their economic position is not substantially improved since they are hired at low wages from a large pool of available female labor.

Policy aimed at improving the economic situation of rural women must do more than simply provide low-wage employment. Rural women must be provided with adequate training for high-wage jobs, and adequate avenues should be provided which will provide them with access to better jobs.

APPENDIX A: Items in Job Efficacy and Small Farm Policy Scales

Job Efficacy Scale	Mean
I have a great deal to say about what goes on where I work.	2.39
*I don't think my boss cares much about what I think.	2.54
*Sometimes what happens at my work seems so complicated that I can't understand what's going on.	2.71
*If I don't like my work the only thing I can do is quit.	2.65
Alpha = .86	Scale Mean 10.29

*Responses to these items were reversed for scaling purposes.

Small Farm Policy Scale	
Government should have a special economic policy to ensure that small family farms survive.	4.06
Government should provide special support for the establishment of farm cooperatives for small farmers.	3.61
Small family farms aren't profitable because government policy favors large farms.	3.42
Alpha = .70	Scale Mean 11.08

Table 1. Labor Force Participation of Metropolitan, Nonmetropolitan and Farm Women

Employment	Metropolitan (N=888)	Nonmetropolitan (N=3349)	Farm (N=1163)
	percentage		
Unemployed	7.5	9.6	5.7
Retired	8.9	10.5	11.9
Employed	53.6	47.7	37.8
Part-time	71.0	77.8	70.7
Full-time	29.0	22.2	29.3
Homemaker	30.0	32.3	44.6
Total percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 2. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Metropolitan, Nonmetropolitan, and Farm Women by Labor Force Participation

Age	Metro working (N=470)	Metro not working (N=397)	Nonmetro working (N=1538)	Nonmetro not working (N=1684)	Farm working[a] (N=418)	Farm not working[b] (N=718)
	percentage					
Less than 35	37.5	32.5	45.7	28.9	28.2	19.9
35 - 54	45.1	28.0	39.9	29.4	54.9	33.7
55 - 64	13.2	20.1	12.0	17.4	13.4	21.5
65 +	4.3	19.4	2.5	24.5	3.6	24.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Education	(N=475	(N=412)	(N=1590)	(N=1732)	(N=425)	(N=741)
	percentage					
Some college or higher	55.3	45.5	47.2	27.0	46.3	22.6
Family Income	(N=449)	(N=364)	(N=1511)	(N=1540)	(N=411)	(N=674)
	percentage					
Less than 5,000	7.8	15.4	12.2	33.1	8.0	28.2
5,000 - 14,999	31.1	28.8	42.8	37.2	31.6	37.1
15,000 - 19,999	17.6	18.1	16.3	11.9	20.0	15.6
20,000 - 29,999	28.7	26.3	10.9	12.5	27.3	11.6
30,000 and over	14.7	11.3	8.3	5.2	13.1	7.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Marital Status	(N=474)	(N=410)	(N=1589)	(N=1744)	(N=420)	(N=738)
	percentage					
Never married	13.9	4.9	14.4	5.8	3.8	2.4
Married	69.4	78.3	69.8	74.3	90.5	85.1
Divorced/ Separated	10.1	3.1	9.3	4.7	0.7	0.9
Widowed	6.5	13.1	6.5	5.2	5.0	11.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Children under 18	(N=475)	(N=412)	(N=1592)	(N=1752)	(N=426)	(N=744)
MEAN	1.932	2.151	1.767	2.060	1.876	1.967

[a]Working refers to nonfarm employment.

[b]Not working refers to not working off the farm.

Table 3. Distribution of Farm Women by Farm Size and Sales

Farm Size	% all Farm Women (N=1218)	% working in category	Farm Sales	% all Farm Woman (N=1011)	% working in category
less than 50 acres	34.1	37.9	less than $1,000	21.5	37.8
50 - 99 acres	22.4	35.0	$1,000 - $2,499	21.7	36.5
100 - 179 acres	19.4	39.6	$2,500 - $9,999	29.9	47.4
180 - 259 acres	10.6	32.2	$10,000 - $19,999	12.2	32.2
260 - 499 acres	8.9	34.0	$20,000 - $39,999	8.3	22.9
500 acres or more	4.7	37.0	$40,000 or more	6.4	27.0
Total percentage	100.0		Total percentage	100.0	

Table 4. Occupations of Employed Metropolitan, Nonmetropolitan and Farm Women by Full-time, Part-time Status

Occupation	Metro		Nonmetro		Farm	
	Full-time (N=303)	Part-time (N=118)	Full-time (N=1125)	Part-time (N=302)	Full-time (N=275)	Part-time (N=109)
	percentage					
Professionals-clergy	24.0	22.0	20.6	14.9	26.2	10.1
Managers, Proprietors, Officials	11.4	2.5	8.5	6.3	8.4	8.3
Clerical	34.4	30.5	30.0	30.8	28.4	36.7
Sales	4.5	12.7	4.5	12.6	2.9	13.8
Crafts	1.0	0.0	0.8	0.7	1.5	0.9
Operatives	6.8	2.5	12.0	4.0	8.0	7.3
Service-military	11.0	22.0	11.8	24.2	10.9	13.8
Laborers	6.8	7.6	11.7	6.6	13.8	9.1
Total percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5. Industry of Employed Women by Place of Residence, Full- or Part-time Status

Industry	Metro		Nonmetro		Farm	
	Full-time (N=261)	Part-time (N=104)	Full-time (N=955)	Part-time (N=252)	Full-time (N=242)	Part-time (N=93)
	percentage					
Agriculture/Forestry	0.4	0.0	0.5	1.2	5.4	5.4
Mining	0.4	0.0	1.2	0.4	0.4	0.0
Construction	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.0
Manufacturing/ Durables	7.3	1.9	5.7	2.0	3.3	1.1
Manufacturing/ Nondurables	7.3	2.9	14.3	4.8	13.6	6.5
Transportation/Communication/Utilities	5.7	0.0	2.7	1.6	3.7	3.2
Wholesale Trade	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.6	2.5	1.1
Retail Trade	9.2	16.3	11.8	23.4	6.6	21.5
Finance/Insurance/ Real Estate	10.7	5.8	6.4	3.2	7.9	4.3
Service	47.9	67.3	46.3	57.1	47.9	47.3
Public Administration	8.8	3.8	9.6	4.4	9.1	9.7
Total percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6. Zero-Order Correlation Matrix

Residence	Correlates	Work	Age	Education	Number of Children	Metro Proximity	Income	Unemployment	Job Opp.	Farm Policy	Job Efficacy
Farm	Work	1.									
	Age	- .269*	1.								
	Education	.327*	- .257*	1.							
	No. of Children	.089	- .533*	.104	1.						
	Metro Proximity	.027	- .087	.110*	.029	1.					
	Income	.277*	- .332*	.455*	.190*	.118*	1.	1.			
	Unemployment	- .045	- .101	- .168*	.053	.058	- .240*	- .450*	1.		
	Job Opp.	.006	.145*	.117*	- .037	- .110*	.140*	.211*	- .137*	1.	
	Farm Policy	- .008	- .032	- .167*	.022	.024	- .131*	- .113*	.131*	- .172*	1.
	Job Efficacy		- .071	.255*	.008	- .005	.240*				
Rural Nonfarm	Work	1.									
	Age	- .293*	1.								
	Education	.272*	- .257*	1.							
	No. of Children	.027	- .410*	.001	1.						
	Metro Proximity	.025	- .084*	.151*	.038	1.					
	Income	.235*	- .278*	.443*	.169*	.161*	1.				
	Unemployment	- .070	- .114*	- .159*	.104	.009	- .210*	1.			
	Job Opp.	.022	.166*	.108*	- .095*	- .079	- .121*	- .419*	1.		
	Farm Policy	- .059	.008	- .147*	.032	- .013	- .177*	.181*	- .110*	1.	
	Job Efficacy		- .153*	.267*	.035	.052	.247*	- .119*	.130*	- .168*	1.

*$p \leq .001$

TABLE 7. Regression Coefficients of Active Labor Force Participation on Demographic Characteristics of Rural Farm and Nonfarm Women

Demographic Characteristics (N)	Farm (914)			Nonmetro politan Nonfarm (2556)		
	B	Beta	F	B	Beta	F
Income	.284	.119	11.368*	.310	.122	34.039*
Age	-.677	-.209	30.646*	-.879	-.292	195.097*
Education	.661	.229	43.619*	.452	.148	50.627*
Number of Children	-.271	-.068	3.582	-.701	-.166	67.827*
MEtro Proximity	-.158	-.028	0.825	-.193	-.035	3.570
Constant	.321			.621		
$\overline{R^2}$	.153			.157		
F	33.913			95.312		

P $\leq$ .001

TABLE 8. Regression Coefficients of Attitudes of Rural Farm and Nonfarm Women

	Nonmetropolitan (N=2556)			
	Unemployment	Job Opportunities	Small Farm Policy	Job Efficacy
Age	-.17*	.20*	-.03	-.03
Education	-.11*	.11*	-.09	.21*
Income	-.21*	.13*	-.15*	.10
Number of Children	.07	-.03	.04	.00
Metropolitan Proximity	.04	-.10*	.02	.01
Work	-.02	.00	-.01	
Adj R^2	.09	.07	.04	.07

	Farm (N=914)			
	Unemployment	Job Opportunities	Small Farm Policy	Job Efficacy
Age	-.18*	.22*	-.08	.07
Education	-.16*	.12*	-.16*	.26*
Income	-.24*	.15*	-.09	.15*
Number of Children	.00	.05	.00	-.05
Metropolitan Proximity	.07	-.11*	.04	-.04
Work	.02	-.03	.05	
Adj R^2	.09	.07	.04	.10

$P \leq .01$

REFERENCES

Baker, Elizabeth

1964 Technology and Women's Work. New York: Columbia University Press.

Beck, E.M., Patrick M Moran, and Charles M. Tolbert II.

1978 "Stratification in a dual economy: A sectoral model of earning determination," ASR 43: 704-720.

Boulding, Elise

1979 "The labor of farm women in the United States: A knowledge gap." Paper presented at American Sociological Association Meetings, Boston, August.

Coughenour, C. Milton

1980 "The impact of off-farm occupation and industry on the size and scale of part-time farms." Paper presented at the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, Hot Springs, Arkansas.

Frauendorfer, Sigmund

1966 "Part-time farming: A review of world literature." World Agricultural Economics - Rural Sociology Abstracts 8 (1, March): V-XXXVII.

Friedmann, Harriet

1978 "World market, state, and family farm: Social bases of household production in the era of wage labor." Comparative Studies in Society and History 20(4): 545-586.

Fuguitt, Glenn, Anthony Fuller, Heather Fuller, Ruth Gasson, and Gwyn Jones

1977 Part-Time Farming: Its Nature and Implications. Centre for European Agricultural Studies: Wye College, Ashford, Kent, England.

Hedley, Max J.

1976 "Independent commodity production and the dynamics of tradition." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 13 (4): 413-421.

Joyce, Linda M., and Samuel M. Leadley

1977 An Assessment of Research Needs of Women in the Rural United States; Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography. Pennsylvania State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.

Lodwick, Dora G. and Polly A. Fassinger

1979 "Variations in agricultural production activities of women on family farms." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Burlington, Vermont, August 24-26.

Loomis, Ralph

1965 A Profile of Part-time Farming in the United States. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State Univeristy, Department of Agricultural Economics and Economics Research Service, U.S.D.A.

Lyson, Thomas

1979 "Production agriculture: An emerging occupational orientation for women in colleges of agriculture." In Proceedings Southern Association of Agricultural Sciences, Rural Sociology Section.

Morrison, Peter A. and Judith P. Wheeler

1976 "Rural renaissance in America." Population Bulletin 31 (3), October.

Oppenheimer, Valerie Kincade

1970 The Female Labor Force in the United States. Berkeley: University of California.

Pearson, Jessica

1979 "Note on female farmers." Rural Sociology 44 (1): 189-200.

Salamon, Sonya and Mackey Keim

1979 "Land ownership and women's power in a Midwestern farming community." Journal of Marriage and the Family 41 (1)" 109-119.

Wilkening, E.A. and Denton E. Morrison

1963 "A comparision of husband and wife responses concerning who makes farm and home decisions." Journal of Marriage and the Family 25 (Aug.) 349-351.

Wilkening, Eugene A., and Nancy Ahrens

1979 "Involvement of wives in farm tasks as related to characteristics of the farm, the family and work off the farm." Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meetings; Burlington, Vermont.